



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/696,953	10/30/2003	Jeffery A. Engelman	BLD920030026US1	9064
50441 7590 07/23/2010 DUFT BORNSSEN & FISHMAN, LLP 1526 SPRUCE STREET SUITE 302 BOULDER, CO 80302				
EXAMINER DHINGRA, PAWANDEEP				
ART UNIT 2625		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 07/23/2010		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/696,953

**Applicant(s)**

ENGELMAN ET AL.

**Examiner**

PAWANDEEP S. DHINGRA

**Art Unit**

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 April 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/CD)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

- This action is responsive to the following communication: Amendment after non-final action filed on 4/22/2010.
- Claims 1-21 are pending.

### ***Response to arguments***

Applicant's amendments, filed 4/22/2010 have been entered and fully considered. However, applicant's arguments filed 4/22/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that none of the cited references teach "linking new font resource to first base font resource to in effect delete the received character from said first base font resource" as recited in claim 1.

In reply, examiner asserts that Flowers, Jr. teaches linking new font resource to first base font resource to in effect modify an existing character in said first base font resource, wherein said new font resource and said first base font resource act as if they are a unified font resource (see col. 5, lines 6-15, 25-61; col. 7, lines 4-41; col. 11, lines 27-66; col. 12, lines 33-39, note that font object includes user specified instructions, glyph mappings, rendering instructions, and all the information required to modify the font is stored in storage 18).

And Masumoto teaches effectively modifying a character comprising deleting (making the data invisible or not to be displayed) the character from a font resource (see paragraph 158).

Thus, from the teachings of Flowers and Masumoto, it would have been obvious to one with the ordinary skill in the art to conclude that modifying an existing character in first base font resource could include making the character invisible or have it appear deleted in order to come up with the invention such that linking new font resource to first font resource to in effect delete the received character from first font resource.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101**

Previous 101 rejections made to claims have been withdrawn in view of amendments made to the claims by the applicant.

However, claims 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 8-14 recite a computer-readable medium, but neither the claim nor the disclosure limit the medium to the statutory embodiments. Such recitation could be reasonably understood to include computer readable media that cover signals per se, which the USPTO must reject under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as covering both non-statutory subject matter and statutory subject matter. In an effort to assist the Applicant in overcoming a rejection or potential rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 in this situation, the examiner suggests the following approach: a claim drawn to such a computer readable medium that covers both transitory and non-transitory embodiments may be amended to narrow the claim to cover only statutory embodiments to avoid a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 by adding the limitation "non-transitory" to the claim.

***Examiner Notes***

Examiner cites particular paragraphs, columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that, in preparing responses, the applicant fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Kuo et al., US 6,603,478 in view of Flowers, Jr. et al., US 5,533,174 further in view of Masumoto et al., US 2002/0036652.

Re claim 1, Kuo discloses a computer implemented method (fig. 1A) for switching fonts without embedding font switches in the data (see abstract) comprising the steps of: receiving, at the computer (fig. 1A) a character (see figure 4) to be effectively added in a first base font resource (see abstract; figures 3-4, note that if the character code

typed by the user is not the standard code then the request is sent to the server from the computer to supply the desired character from the structured database, the received character is then added to the display or personal computer of the user); creating, at the computer, a new font resource (i.e. structured database) that includes the received character (see abstract; figures 3-4, column 3, line 22-column 5, line 38, note that structured database is coupled to a server, which stores additional characters. It is apparent that if such a database exists it has to be created, and it can be a new font resource. The structured database includes the additional character requested and received by the user of PC, hence includes the received character); and linking, at the computer, said new font resource to said first base font resource to in effect add the received character in said first base font resource (see figures 3-4; column 3, line 22 – column 5, line 38, note that The structured database is coupled to the server, which is linked to the PC, thus the new font resource is linked to the font resource (standard database) on PC to effectively deliver and add the additional characters to the font resource on PC); wherein said new font resource and said first base font resource act as if they are a unified font resource (see figures 3-4; column 3, line 22 – column 5, line 38).

Kuo fails to explicitly disclose receiving a character to be effectively deleted from or modified in a first base font resource; linking new font resource to said first base font resource to in effect delete the received character from said first base font resource.

However, Flowers, Jr. teaches receiving a character to be effectively modified in a first base font resource (see col. 5, lines 6-15, 25-61; col. 6, lines 6-20; col. 7, lines 4-

41, note that client sends make font or get character request to the font server 16. Font server 16 receives the requests and then modifies/customizes the standard font (font includes characters) or font characters according to user specifications and needs of the client system (format specific) in a font storage device 18. The customized font data is then sent back to the client by the server, see also fig. 3, col. 4, lines 28-36; col. 8, lines 2-26; col. 11, lines 27-66); creating a new font resource (client-specific font object) that includes the received character (see fig. 3, col. 5, lines 25-61, col. 8, lines 2-8, col. 11, lines 27-46, col. 12, lines 33-39, note that sever 16 creates a client-specific font object which includes the font and character information specified by the client); linking said new font resource to said first base font resource to in effect modify an existing character in said first base font resource, wherein said new font resource and said first base font resource act as if they are a unified font resource (see col. 5, lines 6-15, 25-61; col. 7, lines 4-41; col. 11, lines 27-66; col. 12, lines 33-39, note that font object includes user specified instructions, glyph mappings, rendering instructions, and all the information required to modify the font stored in storage 18).

Masumoto teaches effectively modifying a character comprising deleting (making the data invisible or not to be displayed) the character from a font resource (see paragraph 158). {Thus, from the teachings of Flowers and Masumoto, it would have been obvious to one with the ordinary skill in the art to conclude that modifying an existing character in first base font resource could include making the character invisible or have it appear deleted in order to come up with the invention such that linking new

font resource to first font resource to in effect delete the received character from first font resource}

It would have been advantageous to modify the character access system of Kuo to include the network font server system as taught by Flowers, Jr. and font modifying techniques as taught by Masumoto in order to supply to clients the "font-specific information which allows them to select a font and specify how the font is to be customized, renders bit maps and/or outlines in a format which is compatible with the text processing applications and operating systems of the individual workstations or printers and supplies the rendered maps and outlines to the workstation and printers" as taught by Flowers, Jr., at column 2, lines 50-61 and such that font data is not physically or permanently deleted but instead is made not to be displayed as taught by Masumoto at paragraph 158. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the apparatus of Kuo with the apparatuses of Flowers, Jr. and Masumoto to reach the aforementioned advantage.

Re claim 2, Kuo further discloses creating at the computer, an entry in a first table indicating said new font resource (i.e. structured database, table 1) is a second base font resource (see column 3, lines 22-67, note that personal computer is a first base font resource and structured database coupled to a server is a second base font resource); and creating at the computer, a second (i.e. type 1 character, table 1) and a third table (i.e. type 2 character, table 1) associated with said new font resource, wherein said second table maps code points to glyph indexes, wherein said third table comprises glyphs (see column 2, line 66-column 5, line 38, note that the standard read



codes (also note that glyphs generate codes) are mapped to the type 1 character codes, and type 2 character codes comprises glyphs, which is same as non-standard character codes ).

Re claim 3, Kuo further discloses creating at the computer, a link list in an entry in said first table (see table 1) associated with said first base font resource to link said new font resource to said first base font resource (see column 3, line 22-column 5, line 42, note that table 1 shows linking the non standard codes stored in structural database with the standard read codes of PC); and indicating in said entry in said first table associated with said first base font resource to reverse linking of said first base font resource to said new font resource if the received character is a character to be modified (see figure 4; column 4, line 34-column 5, line 42, note that as shown in element 88, figure 4, if the new character is to be created after receiving the character data then the linking is not reversed otherwise if the character data is to be further received and modified then the reverse linking is performed and the process proceeds back to element 90, figure 4. Note that the received character data gets formatted and then processed (modified) by the personal computer 22 for displaying purposes).

Masumoto teaches effectively modifying a character comprising deleting (making the data invisible or not to be displayed) the character from a font resource (see paragraph 158).

Re claim 4, Kuo further discloses receiving at the computer, an identification of a font resource and a code point (see figure 3-4); and transmitting said code point to a rasterizer program associated with said identified font resource (see figure 3-5).

Re claim 5, Kuo fails to further disclose said first base font resource is associated with a fourth table and a fifth table, wherein said fourth table maps code points to glyph indexes, wherein said fifth table comprises glyphs.

However, Flowers, Jr. teaches first base font resource is associated with a fourth table (i.e. glyph maps, note that the glyph maps can be constituted as a table) and a fifth table (i.e. fonts or catalogues since, catalogues contain list of fonts, and fonts include glyphs), wherein said fourth table maps code points to glyph indexes (i.e. mappings), wherein said fifth table comprises glyphs (see column 6, line 6-column 9, line 61; column 12, line 5-column 13, line 14).

Re claim 6, Kuo fails to further disclose determining, if said code point indexes in said fourth table; wherein if said code point indexes in said fourth table, then the method further comprises the steps of: procuring a glyph from said fifth table using a glyph index obtained from said fourth table; converting said glyph to a bit map representation; and transmitting said bit map representation to a printer; and wherein if said code point does not index in said fourth table, then the method further comprises the step of: determining if said code point indexes in said second table.

However, Flowers, Jr. discloses determining, at the computer, if said code point indexes in said fourth table; wherein if said code point indexes in said fourth table, then

the method further comprises the steps of: procuring at the computer, a glyph from said fifth table using a glyph index obtained from said fourth table (see column 6, line 6-column 9, line 61; column 12, line 5-column 13, line 14); converting at the computer, said glyph to a bit map representation; and transmitting said bit map representation from the computer to a printer (see figures 3-5; column 6, line 6-column 7, line 56; column 12, lines 23-64); and wherein if said code point does not index in said fourth table, then the method further comprises the step of: determining at the computer, if said code point indexes in said second table (i.e. another glyph map, again different maps can be constitutes as different tables) (see column 6, line 6-column 9, line 61; column 12, line 5-column 13, line 14, note that if the FAF server doesn't find the desired character codes in the glyph map related to the particular font then FAF server looks to different glyph map related to a different font according to requests of the user).

Re claim 7, Kuo fails to further disclose determining if said code point indexes in said second table; wherein if said code point indexes in said second table, then the method further comprises the steps of: procuring a glyph from said third table using a glyph index obtained from said second table; converting said glyph to a bit map representation; and transmitting said bit map representation to a printer; and wherein if said code point does not index in said second table, then the method further comprises the step of: determining if said code point indexes in said fourth table.

However, Flowers, Jr. discloses determining at the computer, if said code point indexes in said second table (i.e. another glyph map, again different maps can be constitutes as different tables); wherein if said code point indexes in said second table,

then the method further comprises the steps of: procuring at the computer, a glyph from said third table using a glyph index obtained from said second table (see column 6, line 6-column 9, line 61; column 12, line 5-column 13, line 14, (i.e. different font or catalogues since, catalogues contain list of fonts, and fonts include glyphs); converting at the computer, said glyph to a bit map representation; and transmitting said bit map representation from the computer to a printer (see figures 3-5; column 6, line 6-column 7, line 56; column 12, lines 23-64); and wherein if said code point does not index in said second table, then the method further comprises the step of: determining at the computer, if said code point indexes in said fourth table (see column 6, line 6-column 9, line 61; column 12, line 5-column 13, line 14, note that if the FAF server doesn't find the desired character codes in the glyph map related to the particular font then FAF server looks to different glyph map related to a different font according to requests of the user).

Re Claims 8-14, claims 8-14 recite identical features, as claims 1-7, except claims 8-14 merely deal with executing the method of claims 1-7 on a computer. Thus, arguments made for claims 1-7 are applicable for claims 8-14.

Re claim 15, Kuo discloses a system (see figure 1), comprising: a client (i.e. PC) configured to generate a first data stream comprising page description information (see column 2, line 54-column 3, line 21); a spool coupled to said client, wherein said spool is configured to store said first data stream (see figure 1; column 2, line 54-column 3, line 21); a resource library (i.e. structured database) configured to store a first base font resource (see figure 1; column 2, line 54-column 3, line 67); a print server coupled to said spool and said resource library (see figure 1; column 2, line 54-column 3, line 67);

wherein said client comprises: a third memory unit operable for storing a computer program for creating a linked resource (see column 2, line 54 –column 4, line 33). Kuo further discloses wherein a processor, responsive to computer program, comprises: circuitry operable for receiving a character to be effectively added to; circuitry operable for creating a new font resource that includes the received character; and circuitry operable for linking said new font resource to said first base font resource to in effect add the received character to said first base font resource, wherein said new font resource and said first base font resource act as if they are a unified font resource. (Note that these features are identical to those recited in claim 1, except claim 15 is an apparatus claim. Thus, arguments made for claim 1 are applicable for claim 15; see explanation of claim 1 above).

Kuo fails to further disclose wherein said print server comprises: a first memory unit operable for storing a printer driver configured to generate a second data stream; and a first processor coupled to said first memory unit; and a printer coupled to said print server, wherein said printer is configured to receive said second data stream generated from said print server, wherein said printer comprises: a second memory unit operable for storing a rasterizer program; and a control unit coupled to said second memory unit; a second processor coupled to said second memory unit; and a processor, responsive to computer program, comprises: circuitry operable for receiving a character to be effectively deleted from or modified in a first base font resource; and circuitry operable for linking a new font resource to said first base font resource to in

effect delete the received character from or modify an existing character in said first base font resource.

However, Flowers, Jr. discloses a print server (i.e. font server, figures 1-2) comprises: a first memory unit operable for storing a printer driver configured to generate a second data stream (see column 4, lines 9-47); and a first processor coupled to said first memory unit (see column 4, lines 9-47, note that it is apparent that the server has a processor); and a printer coupled to said print server (see figures 1-2), wherein said printer is configured to receive said second data stream generated from said print server (see column 4, lines 9-47), wherein said printer comprises: a second memory unit operable for storing a rasterizer program (see column 4, lines 9-47, note that it is apparent that printer has a memory since it has application software stored in it); and a control unit coupled to said second memory unit (see column 4, lines 9-47, note that it is apparent that there has to be a controller/control unit for controlling the application processing performed by printer); a second processor coupled to said second memory unit (see column 4, lines 9-47, note that the controller/control unit for printer is the second processor). Flowers, Jr. further teaches circuitry operable for (see figs. 2-4) receiving a character to be effectively modified in a first base font resource (see col. 5, lines 6-15, 25-61; col. 6, lines 6-20; col. 7, lines 4-41, note that client sends make font or get character request to the font server 16. Font server 16 then modifies/customizes the standard font (font includes characters) or font characters according to user specifications and needs of the client system (format specific) in a font storage device 18, see also fig. 3, col. 4, lines 28-36; col. 8, lines 2-26; col. 11, lines 27-

66); circuitry operable for (see figs. 2-4) creating a new font resource (client-specific font object) that includes the received character (see fig. 3, col. 5, lines 25-61, col. 8, lines 2-8, col. 11, lines 27-46, col. 12, lines 33-39, note that sever 16 creates a client-specific font object which includes the font and character information specified by the client); circuitry operable for (see figs. 2-4) linking said new font resource to said first base font resource to in effect modify an existing character in said first base font resource, wherein said new font resource and said first base font resource act as if they are a unified font resource (see col. 5, lines 6-15, 25-61; col. 7, lines 4-41; col. 11, lines 27-66; col. 12, lines 33-39, note that font object includes user specified instructions, glyph mappings, rendering instructions, and all the information required to modify the font stored in storage 18).

Masumoto teaches effectively modifying a character comprising deleting (making the data invisible or not to be displayed) the character from a font resource (see paragraph 158). {Thus, from the teachings of Flowers and Masumoto, it would have been obvious to one with the ordinary skill in the art to conclude that modifying an existing character in first base font resource could include making the character invisible or have it appear deleted in order to come up with the invention such that linking new font resource to first font resource to in effect delete the received character from first font resource}

Re Claims 16-21, claims 16-21 recite identical features, as claims 2-7, except claims 16-21 are apparatus claims. Thus, arguments made for claims 2-7 are applicable for claims 16-21.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

### ***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **PAWANDEEP S. DHINGRA** whose telephone number is (571)270-1231. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:30-7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/P. D./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/David K Moore/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625